

REMARKS

Claims 67, 76, 88, and 92 have been amended. Claims 68-82, 86-89, 92-98 are pending. Applicant reserves the right to pursue the original claims and other claims in this and other applications.

Claims 67, 76, and 92 have been amended to correct typographical errors.

The drawings stand objected to. The Office Action states that the “signal source having first and second outputs coupled to the first and second transmission members” must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). Claim 88 has been amended to recite “a first and a second signal source respectively having first and second signal outputs.” This feature is supported by the specification. See, e.g., Fig. 8 (illustrating a signal receiver comprising amplifier A1 configured to receive a first signal on a first transmission line 152A and amplifier A2 coupled to configured to receive a second signal on a second transmission line 152B)

Claims 88-89 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The Office Action states that the claims contain subject matter not described in the disclosure. More specifically, the Office Action states that the limitation “signal source having first and second outputs coupled to the first and second transmission member” is not supported by the disclosure. Claim 88 has been amended to address this issue. Accordingly, the rejection to claims 88-89 should be withdrawn.

Claims 88-89 and 92-98 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishimura et al. (US 5,013,942) in view of Doblar et al. (US 6,477,205). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness “the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.”

M.P.E.P. §2142. Neither Nishimura et al. nor Doblar et al., even when considered in combination, teach or suggest all limitations of claims 88 and 92.

Claim 88, as amended, recites, *inter alia*, “[a] signal transmission system comprising: a first and a second signal source respectively having first and second signal outputs.” (Emphasis added.) Nishimura et al. does not disclose this limitation. Nishimura et al. teaches “input line lengths from a point 5A on the output side of a first buffer 10 to each of points 5C, 5D, . . . , 5F, and 5G.” Col. 4, ln. 31-33. There is no first and second signal source. Nor is Doblar et al. cited for this limitation. Thus, Doblar et al. does not remedy the deficiency of Nishimura et al. Since Nishimura et al. and Doblar et al. do not teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 88, claim 88 and dependent claim 89 are not obvious over the cited references.

Claim 92 recites, *inter alia*, “[a] method of synchronizing first and second operations of respective first and second circuits comprising: receiving a first signal transition at said first circuit through a first transmission member...; receiving a second signal transition at said second circuit through a second transmission member...; and receiving said first and second signal transitions at said first and second transmission members synchronously.” (Emphasis added.) Nishimura et al. does not disclose this limitation. Nishimura et al. teaches “input line lengths from a point 5A on the output side of a first buffer 10 to each of points 5C, 5D, . . . , 5F, and 5G.” Col. 4, ln. 31-33. “In order to minimize clock skew caused by the differences of the line lengths, there are provided adjustment capacitances C_{12} , C_{13} , . . . , and C_{1N} for prevention of clock skew.” Col. 4, ln. 35-39. The signal transitions are not received at the transmission members synchronously, but are synchronized at some point along the input line lengths. Nor is

Doblar et al. cited for this limitation. Thus, Doblar et al. does not remedy the deficiency of Nishimura et al. Since Nishimura et al. and Doblar et al. do not teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 92, claim 92 and dependent claims 93-97 are not obvious over the cited references.

Claim 98 depends from independent claim 67 and should be allowable along with claim 67 and for other reasons. Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 88-89 and 92-98 be withdrawn.

Claims 67-82 and 86-87 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admitted prior art (APA) in view of Nishimura et al. and further in view of Doblar et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

None of APA, Nishimura et al., nor Doblar et al., even when considered in combination, teach or suggest all limitations of claims 67 and 87. Claim 67 recites *inter alia*, "[a] signal transmission system comprising: a first and a second signal source respectively having first and second signal outputs." (Emphasis added.) Claim 87 recites, *inter alia*, "[a] signal transmission system comprising: a first transmission member...; a second transmission member...; [and] first and second signal sources coupled to said first and second transmission members respectively." (Emphasis added.) As discussed above relating to the patentability of claim 88, Nishimura et al. does not disclose this limitation. Nishimura et al. teaches "input line lengths from a point 5A on the output side of a first buffer 10 to each of points 5C, 5D, . . . , 5F, and 5G." Col. 4, ln. 31-33. There is no first and second signal source. Nor are Doblar et al. or APA cited for this limitation. Thus, Doblar et al. and APA do not remedy the deficiency of Nishimura et al. Since Nishimura et al., Doblar et al., and APA do not teach or suggest all of the limitations of claims 67 and 87, claims 67 and 87 are not obvious over the cited references. Claims 68-82 and 86 depend from claim 67 and

should be allowable along with claim 67 and for other reasons. Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 67-82 and 86-87 be withdrawn.

In view of the above amendment, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: August 3, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Thomas J. D'Amico

Registration No.: 28,371

Rachael Lea Leventhal

Registration No.: 54,266

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &
OSHINSKY LLP

2101 L Street NW

Washington, DC 20037-1526

(202) 785-9700

Attorneys for Applicant